

### **Remarks**

In view of the following remarks, Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and allowance of the subject application. Claims 1-32 are currently pending.

5

### **Statement of Substance of Interview 7/19/07**

Initially, Applicant wishes to thank Examiner Osberg for conducting a telephonic interview with Applicant's attorney, Daniel T. McGinnity, on 7/19/07.

10 In the interview, Applicant's attorney submitted the differences between the cited reference Jones and the claimed subject matter. In particular, Applicant discussed "legacy windows" as recited in the claims which Applicant asserts is not shown by the references of record. While Jones does describe drawing and redrawing components/objects of a user interface, Jones fails to disclose, teach or suggest at least "determining if a child window of a parent window is a legacy  
15 window" and "causing the child window output to be redirected to an off-screen buffer" as recited in claim 1. Further, Jones does not describe "applying a visual enhancement to the child window output" as also recited in claim 1. No Agreement was reached.

20 Applicant submits that all of the pending claims are in condition for allowance. If any issues remain that would prevent the allowance of the application, Applicant requests that the Examiner contact the undersigned attorney to resolve the issues.

### **35 U.S.C. §112 Rejections**

Claims 18-21 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph as being indefinite. Appropriate correction is made herein. Accordingly the §112 rejections have been obviated.

5

### **35 U.S.C. §102 Rejections**

Claims 1-32 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated U.S. Patent Number 5,363,483 to Jones et al. ("Jones"). Applicant respectfully disagrees.

Claims of the present application are directed at techniques to enhance legacy windows to be output with enhanced visual aspects which may not be available using a legacy display component for which the legacy window was developed. Legacy windows are described throughout the Application as filed. The Examiner is respectfully directed to FIG. 2 and the discussion on p. 6-9 of the specification which provides some examples regarding legacy windows, legacy display components, visual enhancements, and so forth. One of skill in the art, upon reviewing Jones and the subject Application, would readily conclude that Jones does not even imply the concept of a legacy window as described and claimed. For example:

20

**Claim 1** recites a computer-executable method, comprising

- determining if a child window of a parent window is a legacy window;
- if so, causing the child window output to be redirected to an off-screen buffer;
- retrieving the child window output from the off-screen buffer;
- applying a visual enhancement to the child window; and
- composing a visual representation of the parent window with the visually enhanced child window output.

Jones is directed at entirely different subject matter than what is described and claimed. Jones does describe techniques for redrawing objects in a display area when an event that causes a display change occurs. For instance, redrawing in Jones may occur when a drop down list obscures an object and/or when the object is to reappear, such as when a drop down list obscuring an object is closed.

In particular, Jones describes:

A computer display system and technique in which display area is represented as an array of regions, and a record is maintained for each object displayed in the area to identify the regions occupied by the object. When an event occurs that causes a change in the information presented in the display area, the regions that are affected by the change are detected, and an object is updated if its record identifies at least one of the affected regions. Examples of such events include the appearance and removal of dialog boxes, pull-down menus, and other items that may obscure the objects when displayed, and changes in the display characteristics (e.g., color) of the objects. *Jones, Abstract.*

Thus, Jones operates to update a display area based on an event such as appearance and removal of dialog boxes, pull-down menus, and other items that may obscure the objects when displayed, and changes in the display characteristics

(e.g., color). However, Jones is silent as to legacy windows, techniques employed to visually enhance legacy windows, a determination as to whether a window is a legacy window, or even child windows of parent windows. Accordingly, there is no way in which Jones may be construed as providing the claimed features.

5 Simply stated, Jones is directed at different techniques, performed in a different manner and to achieve different results than the subject matter which is described and presently claimed in the subject Application.

In rejecting claim 1, the Examiner cites to Jones FIG .10; col. 8 lines 63-67; and col. 9 lines 1-10 for “determining if a child window of a parent window is a legacy window”. *Office Action*, p. 4-5. However, FIG. 10 shows only a work area partitioned into regions each of which corresponds to a region of display area 22 as described in the following excerpted portions of Jones, which are relied upon by the Examiner:

15 Referring also to FIG. 10, work area 38 is partitioned into regions 45 each of which corresponds to a region 54 of display area 22. Thus, work area 38 includes thirty equal size regions 45 arranged in a 6.times.5 array. When an object A-E redraws itself into work area 38, it writes its pixel data into the same regions 45 (and thus the same pixel locations) as it would if the object were to redraw itself directly in regions 54 of display area 22. *Jones*, col. 8 lines 55-62.

25 In the case of display event 74 (i.e., the display and subsequent removal of obscuring item 77), objects A and B determine during step 106 that they must be redrawn (because their AND operations reveal a logic "1" match between the entries of their bit masks 56, 58 and those of initial change mask 82). More specifically, object A finds a logic "1" match with initial change mask 82 for entries 1, 2, 7, and 8 of its bit mask 56, while entry 8 of object B bit mask 58 yields a logic

30

"1" match with corresponding entry 8 of initial change mask 82. None of the other objects C-E find a logic "1" match during the AND operation. Thus, as shown in FIG. 10, only objects A and B redraw themselves into work area 38, and they do so in the same pixel locations as if they were redrawing themselves in display area 22 rather than in offscreen memory. *Jones, col. 8 line 63 - col.9 line 10.*

Jones does not mention or even imply the concept of a legacy window in the cited portion or elsewhere. There is not even a determination which is referenced in the portions of Jones relied upon by the Examiner. Accordingly, there is no way that Jones may be relied upon for "determining if a child window of a parent window is a legacy window" as asserted in the Office Action.

As Jones does not provide any basis for "determining if a child window of a parent window is a legacy window", Jones further fails to disclose actions which are taken responsive to the determining of claim 1, such as "causing the child window output to be redirected to an off-screen buffer; retrieving the child window output from the off-screen buffer; applying a visual enhancement to the child window".

For instance, with respect to "applying a visual enhancement to the child window", the Office Action on p. 4 cites to the following excerpted portion:

Referring again to FIG. 4, each object A-E builds its bit mask 56-62 as it is established by processor 14 (step 70). In addition, objects A-E update their bit masks 56-62 when necessary to reflect a change in the position or size of object in display area 22. *Jones, col. 6 lines 14-18*

Per the above excerpted portion, Jones does describe an object updating a bit mask to reflect a change in position. However this is not equivalent to a visual enhancement. The bit mask data described in Jones is to draw the same object with the same visual appearance in a different location. While Jones may draw or redraw an object based on whether the object or a portion is obscured, this is not equivalent to the claimed features. Simply drawing objects responsive to events such that obscured object may become visible or a visible object obscured is not equivalent to “applying a visual enhancement to the child window”.

For at least the foregoing reasons, a *prima facie* case of anticipation has not been established with respect to claim 1. The rejection of claim 1 is in error for at least these reasons. Accordingly, withdrawal of the rejection and removal of the Jones reference is respectfully requested.

Claims 2-8 depend from claim 1 and are allowable over Jones at least based on this dependency. Claims 2-8 are also allowable for their own recited features which the references of record fail to disclose teach or suggest. For instance:

**Claim 2** recites:

- The method recited in claim 1, wherein the legacy window is configured to be administered by a legacy display component having fewer visual enhancements than a Media Integration Layer (MIL) component.

As noted above, Jones fails to even mention a legacy window or anything that may be construed as equivalent to the concept of legacy windows. Jones, further fails to describe legacy window or any other window or object that is “configured to

be administered by a legacy display component having fewer visual enhancements than a Media Integration Layer (MIL) component” as contemplated in claim 2. Jones is silent as to legacy display component or MIL. Further, Jones does not describe or even imply different display components that have different visual enhancements. Thus, Jones does not disclose, teach or suggest the recited features of claim 2. Claim 2 is allowable for these additional reasons.

**Claim 3** recites:

- The method recited in claim 2, wherein causing the child window output to be redirected comprises instructing the legacy display component to redirect the child window output to the off-screen buffer.

As noted above, Jones fails to even mention a legacy window or anything that may be construed as equivalent to the concept of legacy windows. Jones also is silent as to redirecting output of a child window determined to be a legacy window via a legacy display component. In rejecting claim 3, the Examiner relies on Jones, col. 8 lines 3-16. *Office Action*, p. 5. Applicant does not understand the relevance of the particular passage to the features of claim 3, which states:

After each object A, D that has changed performs the logic OR operation using its bit mask 56, 62, it begins preparing to redraw itself (step 97) in anticipation of a "repaint" command that application program 16 will send in response to receiving an initial change mask 98 that includes a logic "1" in any of its entries 99. This reduces the time needed for objects A, D to redraw themselves when the repaint command is issued. Thus, objects A and D recalculate their dynamic properties, such as color, x-y location, and x-y scale. In addition, some objects (such as object D) can be "filled" by various amounts, for example to resemble a the level of fluid in a container. The filling level is also a dynamic property that is changed in step 97. *Jones*, col. 8 lines 3-16.

The above excerpt does not describe anything related to the features of claim 3. Jones does describe in other portions using an off-screen memory to perform the described techniques for redrawing objects. However, simply using of an off-screen memory does not provide a basis for the particularly recited aspects of claim 3. Further, the off-screen memory as described in Jones is used as an integral part of the techniques described in Jones, each time and for every object. Accordingly, the use of off-screen memory in Jones may not be construed as a redirection of the output. Further, the use of off-screen memory in Jones is not performed responsive to a determination of whether an object is a legacy component. Thus, Jones does not disclose, teach or suggest the recited features of claim 3. Claim 3 is allowable for these additional reasons.

**Claim 4** recites:

- The method recited in claim 3, wherein the legacy display component comprises a user subcomponent and a Graphics Device Interface subcomponent.

In rejecting claim 4, the Examiner relies upon Jones, col. 10 lines 53-60 which simply states:

The microfiche appendix of source code embodies the procedure for updating displayed data objects described and claimed in this application, and is incorporated herein by reference. It may be implemented on any computer (such as an Intel DOS-based computer, a Digital Equipment Corporation VAX-based computer, etc.) that operates using any suitable operating system which includes a multitasking operating system, e.g., Windows 3.1. In addition, any suitable ANSI-standard C-compiler, object linker, and library manager can be used. *Jones, col. 10 line 53-60*



The above excepted portion is entirely silent as to a legacy display component, a user subcomponent, or a Graphics Device Interface subcomponent. Jones in fact is silent as to these aspects of claim 4. A global statement that the “procedure for updating displayed data objects may be implemented on any computer” does not provide a basis for particularly recited aspects of claim 4. Claim 4 is allowable for these additional reasons.

**Claim 5** recites:

- The method recited in claim 1, wherein the visual enhancement comprises a selected one or more from a group comprising re-sizing, re-shaping, relocating window component output, applying transparency, rotating and translating window component output, and applying a texture or visual effect to the window component output.

As noted, Jones does not even describe applying visual enhancements. Jones is also silent as to the example visual enhancements recited in claim 5. Jones simply describes drawing and redrawing objects which does not involve enhancements to the objects. Examiner relies on Jones, col. 8 lines 10-16, which simply discusses an object recalculating dynamic properties when being redrawn. However, this is not a visual enhancement. Rather this is redrawing of the same object in a different location. Further, the particular visual enhancements of claim 5 are not described in the cited portion or elsewhere. Claim 5 is allowable for these additional reasons.

**Claim 6** recites:

- The method recited in claim 1, wherein the visual enhancement comprises scaling the child window output to reflect a different screen resolution than originally applicable.

As noted, Jones does not even describe applying visual enhancements. Jones is also silent as to the example visual enhancements recited in claim 6. There is nothing in Jones related to “scaling the child window output to reflect a different screen resolution than originally applicable”. The terms scaling and resolution do not even appear in Jones. Claim 6 is allowable for these additional reasons.

**Claim 7** recites:

- The method recited in claim 2, wherein composing the visual representation of the parent window is performed by the MIL component.

There is no basis in Jones for the recited Media Integration Layer (MIL) component. The Examiner refers to a general description of a computer system of FIG. 1 in Jones (col.3, lines 36-44) which is silent as to a MIL component. Even if a MIL component were to be included in the general computer of FIG. 1, it is through pure conjecture alone that the Examiner arrives at a conclusion that the techniques of Jones use the MIL, as no reference is made to a MIL anywhere in Jones. Further claim 1 recites “composing a visual representation of the parent window with the visually enhanced child window output” which per claim 7 “is performed by the MIL component”. No basis is given for a MIL, or even another component that composes a visual representation of a parent window having a visually enhanced child window output therein. Jones is silent as to these aspects of claim 7. Claim 7 is allowable for these additional reasons.

Independent claims 9, 17, 22 and 27 each incorporate features similar to those discussed with respect to claims 1-7, in varying terms and scope. Applicant

respectfully submits that, as discussed in the interview, Jones does not disclose, teach or suggest any such subject matter. As such, these claims and their associated dependent claims are allowable based on reasoning which was discussed with respect to claim 1-7. Claims 1-32 are allowable for at least these reasons and withdrawal of the 35 U.S.C. §102 rejection of these claims is respectfully requested.

### **Conclusion**

The Application is in condition for allowance and the Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and issuance of the present application. Should any issue remain that prevents immediate issuance of the application, the Examiner is requested to contact the undersigned attorney to discuss the unresolved issue.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: 8/7/07

By: /Daniel T. McGinnity, #55444/

Daniel T. McGinnity

Reg. No. 55444

Attorney for Applicant

Sadler, Breen, Morasch & Colby, PS

422 W. Riverside Avenue, Suite 424

Spokane, Washington 99201

Telephone: (509) 755-7257

Facsimile: (509) 755-7252